

LABOUR 1s. **MONTHLY**

EDITOR R PALME DUTT

STRINGS OR CHAINS?

by

D. N. PRITT, K.C., M.P.

WHITHER INDIA?

by

R. PALME DUTT

JUNE, 1948

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

	<i>Page</i>
Notes of the Month: <i>Whither India?</i> by R. P. D. ...	161
Strings or Chains? by D. N. PRITT, K.C., M.P. ...	170
With the Imperialists—or with the working class? by ARPAD SZAKASITS (General Secretary, Social Democratic Party of Hungary)	177
Why We Broke With Them by ZDRAVKO MITOVSKY (Secretary-General of the Bulgarian Social Democratic Party)	178
Green Light for War—Nine Years Ago (<i>Continued</i>) by QUÆSTOR ...	179
Caste System in Britain by P. H. H. BRYAN	185
<i>100 Years Ago</i> —The June Revolution	188
<i>Book Reviews—</i>	
The Rape of Palestine by William B. Ziff: <i>Michael Katanka</i> ...	191
Marching with the Times by Douglas Goldring: R. P. D.	192
Local and Regional Government by G. D. H. Cole: <i>Noreen Branson</i>	192

“To the Unknown Subscriber . . .”

That was how a letter was addressed, and sent to us for forwarding, by a leading member of the Free German trade unions in Berlin. It begins:

“ Dear Friend,

We have been informed through Labour Monthly that you have paid a subscription for us. Permit us to express our heartiest thanks. By subscribing to the Labour Monthly for us, you are enabling us to pursue our work of keeping the German trade union movement informed about the activities overseas.”

It has now been forwarded to their Unknown Subscriber—in Ireland.

THE UNFORESEEN

It was just one more unforeseen result of our appeal in April asking for volunteers to pass on their copy to people in Germany (who cannot send money out to pay for a subscription), to political prisoners and to members of the forces. What a response! The plan seemed to go straight to the heads—and hearts—of the readers. It drove some of them to their pockets, what's more. Not content merely to pass on their copy (“ . . . your publication is too valuable to be left lying around idle”, as a thrifty Scot wrote) they decided to buy

(Continued on page iii of cover)

Whither India?

THIS issue goes to press before the Whitsun Conference of the Labour Party. It would accordingly be premature to comment at this stage on the crisis of Labour Party policy and development which has shown itself in an initial form in the expulsion of one M.P. and the threat of expulsion against twenty-one others for the crime of greeting fellow socialists in the fight against capitalism. The infection of the witch hunt spreads fast. What begins as excommunication of the Communists soon becomes excommunication of European Social Democrats who support working class unity and then turns into excommunication of the left wing of the Labour Party. For the moment the Twenty One, while maintaining their opinions, have kissed the rod and promised not to repeat the heinous offence of recognising fellow socialists without a certificate of permission from the allies of Toryism. The Scarborough Conference, with its filleted representation from the trade unions, will no doubt be intended to register the triumph of the Tory alliance as a triumph of "unity", and to ignore the warning signal of falling individual membership alongside rising Communist membership. But the issues will not be so easily stilled; nor will the gag that may be applied to M.P.s be so easily applied to the militant working class. Every new development of the situation makes the choice before the labour movement more sharp and inescapable. The fight will go forward.

India and the World

The "cold war" which is being waged by General Marshall and President Truman, with the aid of Mr. Bevin and other satellites, against the left, is not only being waged in Europe. It is also being waged in Asia, as in Africa and Latin America. In the Middle East, amid a trail of blood and oil, the murderous provoked conflicts in Palestine and inter-imperialist haggling over its future, to defeat the United Nations solution and prevent the freedom of its peoples; the arming and subsidising of the puppet Princes and chieftains of the Arab League; the domination of the American Mission in Iran, and the rising of the Iraqi people to throw out the Anglo-Iraq Treaty and expel in flight beyond the frontiers the quisling Premier who signed it: all testify to the struggle between freedom and domination that goes forward. In Japan General MacArthur, the rejected even of the American Republicans, works to build up and equip the industrial and military base for renewed aggression under the same old "Co-Prosperity" leadership against the advance of democracy in Asia. The Vietnam Republic and Indonesian Republic continue their unbroken struggle against the barbarous warfare and treacherous double-dealing of French and Anglo-Dutch imperialism. Korea presses

forward to freedom in face of the American stranglehold. In China, the heart and centre, the leader and vanguard of the national and colonial liberation struggle against imperialism for over one-third of a century, the victorious advancing Democratic Armies under the leadership of Chinese Communism are routing the satellite corrupt American-based regime of Chiang Kai Shek, despite all the flood of American arms, planes, dollars and occupation forces, and are preparing the final end of foreign intervention and imperialism in China and the final triumph of Chinese national freedom and democracy. But in all this great alignment, in all this mighty freedom struggle which is surging through the countries of Asia, where stands India—India that represents one-third of the population of Asia and nearly one-fifth of the population of the world?

Which Way India?

Where stands India? Is India ranged in the camp of the struggle for freedom or in the camp of the oppressors? Will India follow the path of Free China, to stand shoulder to shoulder with Free China as the bulwark of freedom in Asia? Or will India follow the doomed path of Chiang Kai Shek's China, of General MacArthur's Japan, of General Marshall's Turkey, to be the pawn, the strategic base, the foreign investor's happy hunting ground, the arsenal of the Anglo-American War Bloc, the gendarme of imperialism in South East Asia? That is the choice that stands before the Indian nation today. The fateful significance and the inescapable urgency of that choice has been emphasised by recent events and ominous warning signals, and not least by the offensive which has now been let loose by the present ruling authorities against the Indian working class movement and the left. The answer to this question will depend on the outcome of the inner political struggle which is now developing within India. This answer will be of no small import, not only for the future of Asia, but for the future of the world.

Illusion and Reality

Since that day of India's heralded "liberation" under the patronage and guardianship of Lord Mountbatten less than one year ago, in August, 1947, what has been the path of development? To the outside world only two pictures have been vouchsafed of India through the zealous reporting of the press. One has been the glowing picture of India "liberated" through the magnanimous generosity and unprecedented renunciation of British imperialism, resulting in a new-born India, "a free and equal member of the British Commonwealth of Nations", miraculously reconciled to the old oppressors. The other has been the lurid picture of India torn with communal strife and murderous massacre, collapsing in a welter of blood and chaos, the inevitable outcome of the ending of the beneficent British rule and demonstration of unfitness of Indians to govern themselves. But across these highly decorated pictures of modern India there has

suddenly broken through during the past few weeks news of a very different kind which has revealed a very different picture. The last days of April and the first days of May have seen a sweeping offensive against the Indian Communist, trade union and peasant movement on a scale unequalled in the history of the Indian working class and unequalled in any country of the British Empire since the war. The veil has been torn aside. The new class realities are laid bare.

A Major Offensive

Why has the new Indian Government under the leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru launched this large-scale police offensive (co-ordinated through the executive machinery of the various Provincial Congress Ministries and publicly approved and justified by the Central Government) against the left wing in India, against the leadership, headquarters offices and press of the Communist, trade union, peasant and student organisations? There is no room for illusions as to the scale of the offensive. In the notorious Meerut Trial twenty years ago, which aroused the universal indignation of the labour and democratic movement in Britain, reaching finally to official protests of the Trades Union Congress and National Council of Labour, thirty-two leaders of the young Indian working-class movement were arrested (some of the best known of the Meerut prisoners, like Dange and Mazaffar Ahmad, are again arrested today). In the present round-up the number of arrests is reported to exceed one thousand, with warrants out for many more, including nearly all the principal leaders of the All India Trade Union Congress and of the Communist Party. Then the trade union movement was still in its infancy, and the Communist movement only existed in its first immature form of Workers' and Peasants' Parties. Today the A.I.T.U.C. has a firmly organised membership of three-quarters of a million, and plays a prominent part in the World Federation of Trade Unions; while the Communist Party, at its important Congress just held at the beginning of March, was able to announce a registered membership of ninety thousand—the largest Communist Party in the British Empire. In West Bengal, the main region of strength, including Calcutta, the Communist Party has been officially banned by the Congress Ministry, and its daily newspaper suppressed; while in other regions conditions of semi-illegality have been imposed. There has been no such overwhelming offensive in the half century of history of the Indian working-class movement. What is taking place is no minor episode in a remote country; it is an attack of the Anglo-American Bloc on a major front of the world working-class movement.

Why the Offensive?

Amazement and bewilderment has been widely expressed in Britain and elsewhere that such an offensive against the working-class should herald the dawn of the supposed "free India", or should have been launched under the auspices of a Ministry headed by Nehru,

whose former record in the left anti-fascist movement and expressions of devotion to socialism are remembered. Not only an official representative of the General Council like Tewson, when the issue was brought up at the Rome meeting of the World Federation of Trade Unions Executive by the Ceylon delegate, Wickremasinghe, acting as substitute for the imprisoned Dange, could seek to take refuge in the plea that it was "unreasonable that Britain should be attacked for events in India when she had left it". The bewilderment extends to genuine elements on the left. Only three years ago Nehru and the Congress leaders were in jail, and the Congress was illegal. Now, liberated by the mass movement in India, as well as with the assistance of mass protest through the labour movement in Britain, they proceed to utilise the same machinery, taken over lock, stock and barrel from imperialism, the same police and ordinances, against the working-class movement on the left.

Smuts and Collins

Memories are short; or some guidance could have been obtained from the numerous examples of analogous experiences, especially in relation to bourgeois national movements, as in the case of General Smuts and Botha in South Africa, or Michael Collins in Ireland, how swiftly the former national rebel, having once entered into a compromise treaty with imperialism, is carried forward by the logic of his position to civil war against his former fellow fighters; just as Collins, within a few months of fighting the British in arms, was turning his arms, no longer against the British, but against his former Republican comrades. But these questionings on all sides, this shocked perplexity before the new events in India, reveal how little the true character of the new political set-up devised and manipulated by Lord Mountbatten has been understood. Imperialist propaganda has woven its web of lies and deceit across the face of India, so that, while the common man in India knows only too well in his life and person how little has changed in the weight of his oppression, world democratic opinion, dependent on fragmentary reports filtered through official monopolist news channels, is startled and caught unawares by the new character of the fight that is plainly developing.

Behind the Veil

In successive issues of this journal we have traced the character of the new settlement in India. In August, 1946, we defined the type of settlement which it was the aim of the Cabinet Mission to prepare, and which reached fruition in the Mountbatten Plan a year later:

The aim to promote a settlement in India on the basis of an alliance with the upper class leaders, and with strong reactionary weightage to the Princes, represents an attempt, not only to stabilise the situation in India, hold down the rising mass forces and protect British interests, but also to maintain India as a strategic base to make India an ally of British imperialism in its general world policy.

In July, 1947, we quoted the characterisation of Lemin with regard to the Mountbatten Plan:

From declarations proclaiming the transfer of power to Indians it is a far cry to true independence for India . . . British ruling circles mean to maintain their economic, political and military positions in India, whatever her future constitutional structure may be. Among other things they bank on the economic ties established between the British and the Indian bourgeoisie . . .

Irrespective of the constitutional changes in India, what really matters is the actual economic, political and military positions that British capital succeeds in maintaining in that country. This will decide whether the long-standing question of independence for India will be settled as it was in the Philippines, or whether India will become a really independent democratic country.

The peculiar character of the Mountbatten Plan was the use of the method of partition to divide and weaken the Indian bourgeoisie and upper class elements, even while making alliance with them in the form of two rival States, and thus to open the floodgates to the murderous currents of communal reaction in the hope of disrupting and wrecking the democratic mass movement. The Mountbatten Plan was followed, as predicted, by hideous communal carnage. Only as these waves have begun to subside, has the new class structure and its political reflection, with the Indian bourgeoisie as the weak junior partner of Anglo-American imperialism, begun to reveal itself in its full force.

Retreat from Nationalisation

Let us examine first the economic side. The tie-up of Indian big business with British and American monopolies, which was already developing in the final stages of the war and provided the basis for the compromise negotiations with the Cabinet Mission and eventual settlement with imperialism, has been carried very much further since the settlement. Already in July, 1947, we noted the assured tone of the I.C.I. Information Bulletin's special confidential report on the "Political Outlook" in India:

There is every reason to believe that the discrimination against foreign businesses which was once feared will not materialise . . .

Nationalisation of industries will not go much further than the Government setting up factories at State expense in all those cases where the ordinary chances of supply and demand do not forecast a probable profit on an adequate scale . . .

On the whole, business interests with substantial resources are justified in not taking too short a view and in being cautiously optimistic.

This confidence has proved justified by the event. The Congress programme had provided for nationalisation of all key resources and industries and extensive State control. Such large-scale nationalisation is essential, not only for progressive reconstruction, but for eliminating the dominant hold of foreign capital in Indian industry. This programme has now been placed in cold storage. In deference to big business demands, decontrol of the prices of food grains and cloth has been rushed through, with consequent soaring of prices and

the cost of living—leading in turn to widespread economic struggles of the workers for higher wages, which have been denounced in the familiar formula as a “political conspiracy against democracy”.

“Share Values are Bound to go Up”

On February 17 of this year Nehru declared to parliament:

There will not be any sudden change in the economic structure. As far as possible, there will be no nationalisation of existing industries.

Reuter's Trade Service Financial Section reported on April 1 from New Delhi:

Large-scale nationalisation of existing industries is ruled out in the Government of India's industrial and economic policy for the next ten years.

On April 6 the Government's Resolution on Industrial Policy, substantiating these predictions, was published. The Explanatory Memorandum published with the Resolution is of especial interest. The Memorandum declares:

The apprehension recently felt in Indian markets that the Government might experiment in nationalisation over a wide field of industries, thereby jeopardising their efficiency and credit, has been completely allayed. The expected result of the announcement of the policy will be the restoration to their former level of the prices of Government securities.

It is expected in knowledgeable quarters that the way is now clear for the Government to float big loans for the purpose of reconstruction now that confidence has returned.

The Memorandum continues to give assurances to allay fears of any possible limitation or control of profits:

Markets were touchy about the possibility of the Government stepping in to regulate and limit profits in private enterprise. The policy as announced contains no hint of this, and share values are bound to go up. Private enterprise therefore receives encouragement.

“Private enterprise . . . encouragement”—the very language is calculated to touch the heart of the American investor and remove any fears of possible socialistic notions in the minds of Congress Ministers.

“Full Freedom for Foreign Capital”

No wonder that the notorious M. R. Masani, publicity officer of the multi-millionaire Tata combine and patron theorist of the Congress “Socialists” (now reorganised as a “Socialist Party”, minus the former Congress label, on the model of European Right Wing Social Democracy to fight Communism), hailed this bold declaration of policy against nationalisation and against limitation of profits as

an advance towards democratic socialism . . . a categorical rejection of totalitarian Communism . . . it aspired to equality of opportunity, and avoided monopoly, public or private

while Professor Ranga called it “a definite triumph of Gandhian Socialism”. It is worth noting that the present leadership of this peculiar “Socialist Party”, who enjoy such close connections with Indian Big Business, appear to have further distinguished themselves

by applauding this Congress-Big Business offensive against the Indian trade unionism and Communism, and demanding its intensification. The real significance of this triumph of "democratic socialism" against "totalitarian Communism" was powerfully underlined when the same official Memorandum accompanying the Government's Resolution on industrial policy proceeds to set out the aim in its final clause:

The Resolution contemplates full freedom for foreign capital and enterprise in Indian industry while at the same time assuring that it should be regulated in the national interest. This part of the Resolution reveals the Indian Government's recognition of the need for foreign aid both in management and technical training and investment, and of the wisdom of welcoming foreign capital and skill to supplement Indian enterprise.

The programme is tolerably clear. This was in April. The political counterpart, expressed in the anti-Red drive, followed in a matter of days.

Dollar Penetration

The increasing penetration of American capital in India has been conspicuous in the recent period. The official organ of the British Export Trade Research Organisation, the *Betro Review*, reports in its issue for November, 1947:

The determination of American capital to enter the Indian market is becoming more and more obvious.

There has been a considerable influx of American technical experts into India. . . . Parallel to the Indo-British combines for manufacture in India, the Americans are also participating in joint Indo-American industrial production. . . . Americans seem to be associated with all the major development projects in the Indian Dominion.

The American Ambassador to India, Dr. H. F. Grady, was the Head of the American Technical Mission to India during the war, which had the task "to investigate the industrial resources of India and recommend ways and means by which the Government of the United States could assist in augmenting India's war production" (its Report was declared confidential and never published). His activity has been intense, not only in promoting American economic penetration, but in open political intervention in public speeches attacking Indian Communism. On March 23 this year, in an address to the Indian Council of World Affairs in New Delhi, he proposed a Marshall Plan for Asia with the participation of India:

Your Marshall Plan, or if you will, your Nehru Plan, might provide for an equally effective programme of mutual aid on a regional basis. There are definite opportunities for trade expansion within the Asian and Far Eastern region.

Surrender to the Princes

No less significant for the political set-up corresponding to this economic line is the surrender which has taken place to the Princes. The traditional outlook of Indian nationalism has always denounced the Princes as reactionary puppets maintained by imperialism, and has called for the establishment of the single sovereign democratic

Republic of India. In the new structure, the Princes' States, which cut across all cultural-national groupings of the people, are not only being maintained under a façade of sham reforms, but are even being consolidated into about twenty-five major units of provincial dimensions.

Mr. V. P. Menon, Secretary of the States Ministry, who is mainly responsible for the rapid change in the political map of India, said that . . . there was no intention to "exterminate" the Princes; in fact, if one of them died childless the title would not be allowed to lapse . . . The indications of this decision are far-reaching, as it may create a social structure the antithesis of the republic visualised by social thinkers here. (*The Times*, 29.3.48).

Thus the Princes are not only to be accepted as a temporary concession; they are to be maintained in perpetuity. The costs of this policy, and of failure to lead the people's struggle against the Princes, are seen in Kashmir and Hyderabad.

Military Control

British soldiers have left India. But all the key strategic controlling positions, alike in the Indian Army and in the Pakistan Army, are still held by British officers, of whom it is reported that there are some three hundred in the Indian Dominion and some five hundred in Pakistan. Recently the decision previously reached to appoint an Indian Commander in Chief has been suspended:

After careful consideration the Government has decided that it would be in the best interests of India and the Army to retain the services of General F. R. R. Bucher as Commander-in-Chief for some time longer. This supersedes an earlier statement by the Defence Minister when he said that by April this year it would be possible to appoint an Indian Commander-in-Chief." (*The Times*, 9.4.48).

Military and naval training, staffing and equipment is closely linked up with Britain, and the operation of air bases with the R.A.F.

"God Save the King"

Recently an illuminating light on the new political relations was afforded by a small item of news which appeared in *The Times* on April 2:

"For the first time since the transfer of power 'God Save the King' will be played before a large public gathering when the first performance of a military tattoo finishes here tonight. This return of pre-Independence Day formalities was decided upon by Pandit Nehru, the Indian Prime Minister, who stated recently that as long as India remained a member of the Commonwealth 'God Save the King' would be played on all formal and military occasions and that the Indian National Anthem would be played afterwards."

If Mr. Attlee were to announce that in future on all ceremonial occasions in Britain the "Star Spangled Banner" will be played in front of the British National Anthem, this would represent a considerably less remarkable shock to British national feeling, already well accustomed to taking second place before the Almighty Dollar, than the above announcement from the former leader of Indian national anti-imperialist revolt ordaining to the startled Indian people the

priority of the hymn of the once hated "satanic" Empire in front of their own national anthem. The Order of Precedence ("the Indian National Anthem . . . afterwards") expresses in a symbolic nutshell the new political set-up in India.

Towards the Democratic Front

But on the same day, April 2, something else happened in India. It was on April 2 that the main All-India raids were carried out on an extensive scale to round up and arrest the leaders of the Indian fight for freedom who had not capitulated, the Indian working-class leaders. With this offensive it was revealed to world opinion that the Indian fight for freedom had entered on a new phase. As the political representatives of the bourgeoisie, fearful of the rising mass revolt, move over to compromise with imperialism, with the reactionary feudal forces in India and with the Anglo-American Bloc, the Indian working-class steps forward to take over the leadership of the battle, and to rally the popular masses and the democratic movement in India in the struggle for national liberation, for the ending of imperialist economic, political and military domination, and for radical social reconstruction. The aim of the Democratic Front, proclaimed by the Indian Communists in their Congress in the beginning of March, corresponds to the new stage of the Indian fight for freedom.

For Democracy and Peace

This fight links up with the advance of the popular democratic fight in all the countries of hitherto subject Asia, with the independence battle of Vietnam and the Indonesian Republic, with the growing strength of the popular movement in Burma (facing the same assault of reaction and repression from the unstable Thakin Nu Government which stands revealed as the agent of the big imperialist monopolies in Burma), with the guerilla fighters of Southern China and the victorious march forward of Liberated China. In India, the oldest base of deeply rooted imperialist domination, the building of the Democratic Front has to go forward against heavy obstacles of the inheritance from the past and fomented divisions. But the deepening crisis compels political awakening; and the ferocity of the repression is a tribute to the extending strength of mass revolt, especially in the countryside under the burden of landlordism, and to the growing influence of Communist leadership. The popular struggle in India is a vital sector of the world front for democracy and peace against the war aims of the Anglo-American Bloc, which strives not only to strengthen imperialist economic domination and exploitation in India, but also to make India a strategic base and arsenal for war. In vain the Indian Government Ministers endeavour to profess their policy of "neutrality" between the two camps in the world today; their professions of "independence" only thinly cover their growing dependence and subordination, economic, political and military, to the Anglo-American Bloc, whose policy is typically expressed in the present anti-communist offensive. For this reason every support that can be given

from Britain and other countries to the Indian working-class in their present ordeal (and especially from Britain, which still holds so dominant a position in practice in relation to India) is not only an elementary duty of working-class solidarity, but also an indispensable contribution to the common fight of the peoples for the victory of democracy and peace.

May 15, 1948.

R. P. D.

STRINGS OR CHAINS? — THE MARSHALL PLAN

By D. N. PRITT, K.C., M.P.

MUCH has been written and spoken about the Marshall Plan, but there is little definite information about it. There is, instead, a flood of reports from Washington and elsewhere that this, that and the other concession has been or will be demanded; and the Government in the recent Foreign Affairs debate (House of Commons, 4th and 5th May, 1948) unfortunately showed a reluctance to answer questions. A number of perfectly reasonable demands for specific information which could and should properly have been given, made in the two main critical speeches, were flippantly dismissed without an answer by Mr. Mayhew on the ground that they were just the product of the Moscow radio. (In truth, they were based almost exclusively on British and American official or press sources). It is so much easier to call a man names than to defend your policy.

It is thus useful to examine the most reliable piece of documentary evidence, namely the "Foreign Assistance Act of 1948", passed by Congress and approved by President Truman on the 3rd April, and to see both what it prescribes and what it passes over.

It betrays, naturally enough, various conflicting tendencies, and it is easy to see from various parts of it, including the title, that it had to be presented to ruling circles in the U.S.A. as emphatically designed to serve American interest almost to the exclusion of any others. True, it is called the "Foreign Assistance Act"; but the politicians who describe it as the greatest act of generosity in human history will feel that the draftsman of its title missed an opportunity to mention its altruism. It is in fact called:

"An Act to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through economic, financial, and other measures necessary to the maintenance of conditions abroad in which free institutions may survive and consistent with the maintenance of the strength and stability of the United States."

So, what is its declared purpose? We may perhaps pass over "the promotion of world peace", which is of course claimed as the

primary object of everybody whose conduct brings about war; and what is left is this:

“The object of this Act is to promote the welfare, the interest, and the foreign policy of the United States (this last being to fight communism everywhere).”

“This object is to be sought by using the economic, the financial, and the ‘other’—i.e. military—power of the U.S.A. to maintain in other countries—perhaps even whether they want it or not—conditions in which free institutions may survive—i.e., conditions of private enterprise, monopoly capital, free entry into all countries of American investment and American imports, and ‘Western civilisation’ generally.”

“Further, the ‘conditions’ thus to be maintained abroad must be consistent with the maintainance of the strength of the United States—of which we are well aware—and of its stability—of which we at times have doubts.”

The undoubted generous instincts of great masses of the American people—which would be most useful if they had any power—has certainly had to give way in this title to the “hard-headed realism” of the American ruling class.

So much for the title. What of the body of the Act? There are four parts or “Titles”. The first and main one is called the “Economic Co-operation Act of 1948”. The second is called the “International Children’s Emergency Fund Assistance Act of 1948”. The third is called the “Greek-Turkish Assistance of 1948” and the fourth the “China Aid Act of 1948”.

Most of our attention must of course be given to the Economic Co-operation Act. It begins with declaration of policy which uses the well-known catch words about individual liberty—so vividly present in the lives of Negroes, poor whites, those who appear before the Rankin-Thomas Committee, and many others—free institutions and genuine independence. It goes on to a clear declaration of the need for “equitable rates of exchanges” and the “progressive elimination of trade barriers”; in other words, free trade, free entry into European markets for powerful United States exporters, and American control over currency.

“Individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence in Europe” are to be sustained and strengthened by assisting European countries which participate in a joint recovery programme based upon self-help and mutual co-operation.

That constitutes a definite policy of assisting certain countries, for certain motives; and at once, as if reactionaries had taken fright and called a halt, there is a proviso; the assistance must not seriously impair the economic stability of the United States, and “continuity of assistance” is to be dependent upon continuity of co-operation among the participating countries.

The countries eligible for aid are defined; they are the sixteen original countries, and any other country or area, wholly or partly in Europe, which joins in the programme. This expressly includes “any of the zones of occupation of Germany” and also the Free Territory of Trieste, for which latter provision is made for immediate assistance up to \$20,000,000.

Then the office of “ Administrator for Economic Co-operation ” is created, and endowed with considerable powers. Among other things, he can “review and appraise” the needs of the various countries for assistance, draw up programmes of assistance, and *put an end to assistance*. And once again the reactionary watch-dog gives a warning bark. The Administrator (Mr. Hoffman of Studebakers), and the Secretary of State (Mr. Marshall), are to keep each other fully informed on all matters; and whenever either of them thinks that any activity or inactivity of the other is “inconsistent with the foreign policy of the United States”—i.e. that it might help any Communist States—he may object, and if necessary the President must decide. (Thus, should Mr. Hoffman want to help any country which the makers of American foreign policy want to weaken, he may well be “vetoed”).

The next provision worth notice is one designed to establish in each assisted country a special American mission for economic co-operation, to assure “the performance within such country of operations” under the Plan. Anyone employed on these missions, or otherwise employed outside the U.S.A., is to be “investigated as to loyalty and security by the F.B.I.”; and Mr. Marshall or Mr. Hoffman has to certify that he or she “is loyal to the United States, its Constitution, and form of government, and is not now and has never been a member of any organisation advocating contrary views”. (Only the President and the Senate together can appoint anyone not so certified).

Then, at rather long last, we reach something concrete as to how assistance may actually be given. Mr. Hoffman may give assistance, when he thinks fit, on various conditions in various ways, the principal ones being as follows:

1. The supply of goods.
2. Processing, storing, transporting, or repairing goods, or rendering any other services. But “as far as practicable” he must ensure that at least half the tonnage of goods carried abroad from the U.S.A. under the plan must be carried in U.S. ships at market rates—a great help to the American merchant fleet, a possible blow to other merchant fleets, and a considerable drain on dollar resources, for American freight rates are hard and high.
3. Technical information and assistance.

In this work, Mr. Hoffman is to “facilitate and maximise” the use of private channels of trade.

The assistance is to be financed either by establishing accounts which may be drawn on, by utilising the services or facilities of any U.S. Government agency, or by guaranteeing investments in connection with projects approved by Mr. Hoffman and by the assisted country.

It will be seen at once, and it has already been widely reported, that there is nothing definite to be found here—and in fact there is little anywhere in the Act—to indicate how much any particular country is to get, nor what quantities of what kinds of goods are to be supplied either to all countries or to any particular country. That is a matter to be negotiated between Mr. Hoffman and the various countries. Beggars can’t do much choosing, but the most unfortunate

form of negotiation to which a beggar can be committed is to start with a general scheme which leaves all the details to be filled in by free and equal negotiations between the beggar and the rich man; and that is the sort of blank chequelessness to which we have been so committed in advance by entering the Marshall plan. If we want to know how much mining machinery we shall get; whether we shall have to take more Virginia tobacco than we want and not nearly enough machinery; whether we shall get ingot steel or merely steel products such as motor vehicles; whether Western Germany—Mr. Dean's Acheson's famous "workshop of Western Democracy"—will get more iron ore and steel scrap than we do; whether we will really have the opportunity to rebuild our industrial plants so as to make them fairly equal competitors of the U.S.A., or will on the contrary be treated more on a "relief" basis and kept as a somewhat colonial country that will continue to need large quantities of U.S. manufactured goods—what is called "exporting American unemployment"; to all these and similar questions we can find answers indicated in the recommendations of Congress Committees or the statements of American ministers, and plenty of these pronouncements give us good ground for anxiety; but we cannot be sure of anything until we come to make a free and equal agreement on the topic with Mr. Hoffman.

The next question on which the Act throws a certain amount of light is the much-discussed one as to whether and to what extent "Marshall aid" has to be paid for or not. It provides that Mr. Hoffman, when giving assistance in the forms already mentioned, may do so by way of grant, or for cash payment, or on credit terms, or on any other terms of payment he likes. This expressly includes the transfer to the United States—terms and amounts to be agreed between Mr. Hoffman and the country concerned—of materials "required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources". This is the famous "stock-piling" provision which may be used to strengthen enormously the war-making power of America and to keep other countries short of essential raw materials.

Then there comes at any rate a little light as to the sort of goods the assisted countries may get. Under the head of "Protection of Domestic Economy", Mr. Hoffman is directed that his procurement of goods in the U.S.A. for Marshall aid is to be so managed as to minimise the drain on U.S. resources and the impact on U.S. economy and to avoid impairing the fulfilment of vital needs of the United States—and who can be surprised an industrial ruling class should do this? In this connexion, petroleum and petroleum products are to be got "to the maximum extent possible" from outside the U.S.; and even then Mr. Hoffman has to consider the present and anticipated shortage in this field, and the consequent undesirability of expansion in petroleum-consuming equipment where alternatives are available. (This from a country whose petroleum consumption is over two-thirds of the total world consumption).

There are next provisions designed to get rid of any agricultural products which are available in excess of American domestic requirements. Such products are to be shipped, in general from the U.S. only; i.e. the assisted countries will not be allowed to have them supplied from other countries, however great the saving might be for them if they could.

And, once again, express provision that "to the maximum extent" private channels of trade are to be used.

Then, some way through the Act, we find the outline of what the assisted countries have to do to receive their aid. Agreements may be made by Mr. Marshall, after consultation with Mr. Hoffman, with any of the countries "or with an organisation representing any such countries". These agreements are to cover a variety of points, some of which call for notice.

The first point covers the promotion of industrial and agricultural production in the assisted country in order to enable it to become independent of extraordinary outside economic assistance. Those who have heard rumours of proposals for keeping these countries under control, and preventing them from becoming so highly productive of finished goods as not to remain good markets for American products, will want to know how far the agreements are to go on such matters. The answer is that, under the agreements envisaged, the countries are to propose specific projects, to be submitted for Mr. Hoffman's approval, and that these projects, whenever practicable, are to include increased production by the assisted country of the basic raw materials, coal, steel, transportation facilities, and food; in other words, they are to be encouraged to become good semi-colonial countries.

The next point to be covered by the agreements is the stabilisation of currencies, the establishment of "valid" rates of exchange, the balancing of budgets, and the restoration or maintenance of confidence in their monetary systems. This goes far beyond mere efficiency and being a "good debtor"; it can easily involve complete financial control, and the permanent opening of markets to full U.S. invasion. This is another point at which many questions arise, and many suggestions have been made, as to what degree of control or interference in either British finance, colonial finance, or the much-wider sterling area is contemplated. Once again, the answer is: wait and see, it is all to be agreed. And once again the reports from America are ominous; taking only the more solid and serious suggestions, we find that we may be called upon to transfer to Mr. Hoffman the control over all dollar expenditure by Great Britain in the sterling area, and perhaps also to submit to a veto on all British capital investments—even in sterling—in the sterling area; there is even talk of an intention to break up the sterling area entirely. The belief that these suggestions are well-founded is of course increased by Mr. Mayhew's silly and insolent refusal to answer questions about them in the recent debate.

Another point covers the tracking down and utilisation for the

Marshall Plan of all assets of the citizens of the assisted countries that are in the U.S.A. or in its possessions.

There follow directions as to arranging the transfer to the U.S.A. of materials for stock piling, as mentioned above.

The next point provides for the deposit in a special account in the assisted country, in its own currency, of funds to match, on an "agreed" basis, the goods or services furnished under the plan. These deposits are to be held or used for "agreed" purposes of various kinds, "including local currency administrative expenditures of the United States" incident to operations under the plan; and the ultimate balances are to be disposed of, subject to the approval of Congress, on an "agreed" basis. It is easy to see that the power over local currencies which will be secured in this way by the U.S. Government must constitute a strangle-hold on any country's finance.

Milder points provide for furnishing full information as to what is being done under the plan, including any information asked for by the U.S. "which would be of assistance to the U.S. in determining the nature and scope of operations and the use of assistance".

The last of the points to be covered by the agreements is a little more complicated; but it is important. The assisted countries are to agree to negotiate "a future schedule of minimum availabilities to the United States for future purchase and delivery of a fair share of materials" required by the U.S. to meet potential deficiencies in its own resources, "so as to protect the access of United States industry to an equitable share of such materials"; and they are equally to agree to negotiate a "schedule of increased production of such materials" in their own countries and the delivery of an agreed percentage of such production to the U.S.A.

It is clear that provisions of this kind make it possible for the United States Government in large measure to determine what we are to produce and to whom we are to deliver the bulk of what we do produce. This amounts not merely to an interference with sovereign independence, but substantially to a shaping of our industrial future by our most powerful competitor.

A provision for substantial control of the running of our industries comes next, in the shape of a direction to Mr. Hoffman to give his encouragement to a joint organisation of all the assisted countries, which it is proposed to set up, to see that each country uses its resources efficiently "by observing and reviewing such use through an effective follow-up system approved by the joint organisation".

Then, without any mention of the Potsdam agreement, Mr. Hoffman is to ask Mr. Marshall to get all the countries to weaken themselves and strengthen the new Washington-controlled Germany, by agreeing:

"that such capital equipment as is scheduled for removal as reparations from the three Western Zones of Germany be retained in Germany if such retention will most effectively serve the purposes of the European recovery programme".

There are still most important provisions to consider. One

relates to the much-discussed question as to whether assisted countries are to be allowed to trade with Eastern Europe. The provision on this point is obscurely worded; but its effect is pretty clear. If an assisted country—say Great Britain—wants to supply to any “non-participating European country”—say the U.S.S.R.—any commodity—say electrical plant—is it forbidden to do so? No, not in so many words. But this is the problem it will have to face; if the commodity is one which the U.S. “in the interest of national security” would not license for exporting from the U.S. to the country in question, then the penalty to be laid upon us for supplying it ourselves will be that Mr. Hoffman must “as far as practicable” refuse to deliver to us any goods which go into the production of the commodity. So, if any manufacturer here wants to bid for the supply of electrical plant to the U.S.S.R. he will have to face the risk that if, by the time he comes to deliver the plant, the U.S.A. has concluded that *it* won’t license electrical plant for export from U.S.A. to the U.S.S.R., he and everyone else here will be cut off from supplies under the Plan of American copper and any other material that goes into such plant. It will in effect be impracticable to contract, or even to allow any of our producers to try to contract for a wide range of supplies to the East, except in so far as Mr. Hoffman chooses to tell us that it will be permitted.

Then there is the question of time. To give Britain and other war-battered countries a real chance to plan their reconstruction, there ought to be some definite period during which a continuation of aid may be relied on. But in fact we are treated like a small shopkeeper trying to build up a business in premises on a quarterly tenancy. Mr. Hoffman is not merely to take into account the extent to which assisted countries are complying with their undertakings when he is deciding on the form and measure of assistance they are to have. He has a much bigger task. He is definitely ordered to “terminate the provision of assistance” to any country, not merely when he thinks it is not keeping its bargain or is making any wrong use of any assistance it has received, but also whenever “because of changed conditions, assistance is no longer consistent with the national interest of the United States.” Such termination includes stopping the delivery of all supplies not already delivered before the termination. This of course amounts to the imposition of a complete veto—by crushing economic sanctions—on any political development in any assisted country that may not suit the changing hysteria of American foreign policy.* M. Molotov was indeed prophetic—or just plain intelligent—when he announced in the summer of 1947 that the Marshall Plan involved an inadmissible infringement of sovereignty.

*Two other “Titles”, viz., “Greek-Turkish Assistance” and “China Aid”, are sheer anti-Soviet adventures of militarist American imperialism. To tack them on to the Economic Co-operation Act, supposed to be just disinterested generosity, is significant evidence of the military basis on which the whole Marshall Plan largely rests; impossible to discuss here.

WITH THE IMPERIALISTS?—OR WITH THE WORKING CLASS

By ARPAD SZAKASITS

(General Secretary, Social Democratic Party of Hungary)

We are pleased to print this specially contributed article from the leader of the Hungarian Social Democratic Party, together with the statement from the brother party in Bulgaria.—Ed. L. M.

THE Hungarian Social Democratic Party attending the Bournemouth Conference in November, 1946, expressed grave concern as to the policy of the socialist parties affiliated in the Labour and Socialist International. This concern increased when the British, Dutch and French parties were found trying to force the admission of the German Schumacher Party to international socialist conferences in spite of the fact that Schumacher's Party undoubtedly pursued the policy of German nationalism.

On the occasion of the International Socialist Conference in Zurich, June, 1947, the British Labour Party started serious negotiations with Saragat on his recognition; and, as we happen to know by now, did definitely propose to divert Nenni's Socialist Party from collaboration with the Communists.

Our experiences during the long period of counter-revolution between the two World Wars as well as the fascist regimes have taught us to analyse and criticise the policy of the Second International. We came to the conclusion that the ways and means of the Second International would never lead to Socialism as those methods are entirely unable to destroy capitalism and frustrate the efforts of imperialism. As soon as capitalism arrived at the period of imperialism and established for its own protection the cruel and brutal system of fascism, no doubt was left to any socialist about the fact that the realisation of Socialism by means of the bourgeois democracy is nothing but mere illusion.

We have come to the conclusion that against the common policy of international capitalism and clericalism should stand the united strength of the organised workers, which is the only means to fight for and proceed to Socialism; because only then the united forces of the working-classes are able to lead us to a road on which we shall come with the least vicissitudes and shortest time to Socialism. Knowledge of all this helped us to form this our own policy.

Unfortunately, we had to recognise that the British, French, Belgian, etc., parties were unable to draw the same conclusions. But as the international situation reflected the ever-growing sharpness of class struggle, it became quite impossible to maintain neutrality, to steer a middlecourse and proceed in a cautious, carefully considered way. The western socialist parties, headed by the British Labour

Party, are not aiming at the destruction of capitalism but at consolidation of its present state. This policy leads to the open and shameful betrayal of the working-class: Leon Blum, Ramadier and some others have acted as traitors to Labour because of their middle-course policy.

But there are other consequences, too: it is due to Mr. Bevin that British policy and British Labour Party became a handy tool of good use for international capitalism backed by America. Only a madman or a scoundrel could believe that capitalism is as soft-minded as to hand over power willingly and anybody basing his policy on such ideas is bound to act as a traitor to the class he ought to lead. The reason of our decision to break up relations with the SILO is as follows: we did not want to give moral support to an organisation usurping the name of "socialists" by attending their gatherings. They do not exercise their power to liberate the working class but to serve and support imperialism which leads inevitably to fascism.

WHY WE BROKE WITH THEM

By ZDRAVKO MITOVSKY

(Secretary-General of the Bulgarian Social Democratic Party)

ON March 27th the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Social Democratic Party took the decision to sever all connections with the Western Socialists. This momentous step was the logical consequence of the persistent cold-shouldering and biased treatment to which our Party has been subjected during the past twelve years by its sister parties of the West. Ever since the Spanish Civil War we have been the step-child of Western socialism; our political proposals were systematically turned down and our co-operation in international actions wilfully ignored.

After the overthrow of fascism two Bulgarian delegates—Dimitar Bratanov and myself—managed to overcome all impediments artificially created by the British Political Representative Boswell and reached Paris in 1945 only to find that Leon Blum's right-hand man, the Secretary-General of the French Socialist Party, Daniel Meyer, was ill disposed toward them. Bulgarian Socialists were not invited to the first post-war Socialist Conference, called in Clacton-on-Sea on the initiative of the British Labour Party, nor were the proposals for taking effective measures against Franco, made by their delegates I. Popov and D. Yeroham, given serious consideration by the Socialist Conference specially held for the purpose in France. Instead the Western Socialists preferred to work out a number of platonic resolutions, repudiating the blood-thirsty Caudillo, yet today they do not hesitate to insist on the inclusion of Franco Spain into the American relief sphere. These very same pseudo-Socialists, led by Denis Healey, voted against the admittance of Bulgarian delegates to the International Socialist Conference in Zurich. And to cap it all, at the Paris Peace Conference, these "fighters for progress and human

rights", while backing the chauvinistic claims of our neighbours, indulged in slanderous accusations against democratic Bulgaria.

Today this old ideological abyss has considerably widened, for Bulgarian Socialists are not afraid to co-operate with their Communist comrades, something which is considered anathema by the "Dollar Socialists".

Our last doubts are gone: we realise that the Western Socialists are no longer promoters of peace and working-class unity nor pioneers fighting for a new economic order. They have degenerated into pitiful stooges of reaction, out to sow dissension within the ranks of the working-class and to betray it.

The "Dollar Socialists" co-operate with de Gaulle, de Gasperi and Franco, but never with the Communist parties in their countries. We, on the contrary, believe that our place is always on the left, on the side of the working-class. We are determined to co-operate with our Communist comrades in order to achieve our great ideal—the triumph of Socialism.

GREEN LIGHT FOR WAR— NINE YEARS AGO

By QUAESTOR

(Continued from the May issue)

IN July of 1939 it became known that Mr. R. S. Hudson, Secretary of the Overseas Trade Department, had had secret interviews with Wohltat, Hitler's economic adviser, promising him "long term credits on a huge scale" and joint exploitation of China and Africa by Germany, the Western Powers and the U.S.A., if Germany would accept arms limitation and evacuate Prague. (*Daily Express*, July 24). The scandal was tremendous, and Chamberlain denied in Parliament (July 24) that the Cabinet knew anything about it, or "any other Minister" than Hudson himself. He also denied that Sir Horace Wilson—the Prime Minister's closest adviser—had discussed such matters with Wohltat. But here is what the Soviet Government has published, in *Falsifiers of History*, on the basis of captured German documents:

"Mr. Hudson and Sir Horace Wilson suggested to Wohltat, and later to the German Ambassador in London, Dirksen, to start secret negotiations for a broad agreement which was to include an agreement for the division of spheres of influence on a world-wide scale, and for the elimination of 'deadly competition in common markets'. It was envisaged that Germany would be allowed predominating influence in South-Eastern Europe. In a report to the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs dated July 21, 1939, Dirksen pointed out that the programme discussed by Wohltat and Sir Horace Wilson comprised political, military and economic issues. Among the political issues a special place, along with a pact of non-aggression, was assigned to a pact of non-intervention which

was to provide for the 'delimitation of *Lebensraum* between the Great Powers, particularly between Britain and Germany'.

"During the discussion of the questions involved in these two pacts, the British representatives promised that, in the event of these pacts being signed, Britain would renounce the guarantees she had just given to Poland . . . Sir Horace Wilson reaffirmed that, in the event of the above-mentioned pacts between Britain and Germany being signed, the British policy of giving guarantees would be virtually abandoned . . . Lastly, it was proposed to supplement the political agreement between Britain and Germany by an economic agreement which would include a secret deal on colonial questions, on the distribution of raw materials, on the division of markets, as well as on a big British loan to Germany."

Thus it became clear, by the last week in July, that the British Government had no real intention of coming to a speedy agreement with the U.S.S.R. to bar the way to war, but that it was desperately offering, by every kind of inducement—including *the bogey of negotiations with the U.S.S.R.*—to do a deal with Hitler at the expense of all and sundry. Rather than commit itself irrevocably to an arrangement with the U.S.S.R. which would threaten Hitler with a two front war whichever way he struck next, the Tory Government was once again trying to buy off Hitler from making any move directly threatening *British* interests.

This was clear, above all, to the Germans. Accordingly, Hitler announced on May 23, 1939, to his assembled Commanders-in-Chief that he had decided "at the first suitable opportunity to attack Poland" (Professor Namier gives the full text of the document from the Nuremberg Trial evidence). Towards the end of May, "incidents" began to multiply between the Nazi authorities of the Free City of Danzig and Polish officials. The Danzig police began to grow "into a small army", and were reinforced by large number of Storm Troops, whose arms were smuggled from Germany. In mid-June, Goebbels delivered inflammatory speeches at Danzig. By July 13, Ribbentrop, the German Foreign Minister, was threatening in a Note to the French Foreign Minister Bonnet that any "Polish provocation" would make the Germans "march immediately and annihilate the Polish army". During the first fortnight of July, the French Ambassador at Berlin was reporting great and growing numbers of reservists called up, "abnormal activity in the German Army . . . obvious preparations for the possibility of an imminent war." By August 15 (his Embassy reported on July 25) Germany would have "about 2,000,000 men under arms", and a raving press campaign against Poland was in full swing.

It is essential to have this background in mind—and all of it was known to the British and French Governments except the secret decision of May 23—in judging of the last phase of the negotiations in Moscow: the military conversations.

In July, General Ironside (Inspector-General of Overseas Forces) had gone to Poland for Staff talks. But when the names of the British Military Mission were announced on July 31, it proved to consist of nobodies: so did the French Mission. The Soviet repre-

sentatives were the People's Commissar for Defence, the Chief of the General Staff, the People's Commissar for the Navy and the Chief of the Air Force. General Ironside had flown to Warsaw. The British Mission—over a fortnight after it had been agreed to send them—arrived by a cargo boat (13 knots) on August 10. "A couple of big seaplanes could not be found or spared", writes Professor Namier ironically. When the two Missions got to Moscow, it was found that they had powers only to negotiate, not to conclude a military convention: they had to refer to London and Paris at every stage. All this was not suggestive of serious intentions. But worse was to come when the discussions opened on August 11.

Marshal Voroshilov asked what precise engagements Britain and France were prepared to assume. He announced (we now know from *Falsifiers of History*) that the Soviet Union would attack with 136 divisions, 5,000 medium and heavy guns, 10,000 tanks and whippets and over 5,000 planes. The British Mission said: "Five infantry divisions and one mechanised division." The French Mission "answered with prudent generalities" (Namier tells us).

Marshal Voroshilov pointed out that, in order to get at the Germans, the Red Army must cross Polish territory. Two lines of passage, North and South, were indicated. The French and British Military Missions said they could not decide this question, and it was referred to their home governments to take up with Poland. On August 17 the Missions reported that they had had no reply yet (the Polish Foreign Minister, Beck, had already refused), and the negotiations were adjourned until the 21st.

Thus, at a time when close on two million German soldiers had been concentrated around Poland's borders, the Polish government was rejecting Soviet military aid. This rejection meant the failure of the military talks: since in the event of war a German walk-over in Poland—inevitable for all but the blind—would mean that the Soviet Union must wait for the Germans to attack it on its own territory—an absurd proposition, acceptance of which no one could expect. Failure of the military talks meant breakdown of the whole negotiations, at the most critical moment in European politics. *And at such a moment the British and French Governments informed the Soviet Government that they were unable to secure Polish consent!*

In order to realise the full measure of villainy—the millions of Europe's dead since 1939 justify the word—which this act meant, one need only recall that, less than a year before, the same Governments had, by threatening to treat their obligations to Czechoslovakia as non-existent, secured the agreement of President Benes to surrender the strongly fortified borderlands of his country to Hitler. About this there is no doubt: the facts have been published often enough. Thus Britain and France were strong enough to force Czechoslovakia—a well-armed and politically united democracy—to *surrender to Nazism*, but "too weak" to force the feeble Polish Government to make it possible to *fight Nazism*. Such a contrast told its own story—and the

story was the same as that told by the earlier negotiations. The British and French Governments didn't want a pact with the U.S.S.R., because they still hoped that Hitler would "go east".

It is characteristic that, after a commercial treaty had been signed between the Soviet Union and Germany on August 19, and it was announced on August 21 that Ribbentrop would go to Moscow to sign a pact of non-aggression, the French Premier Daladier on the 22nd proposed "a threatening diplomatic *démarche* in Warsaw to force Poland into accepting the passage of the Russians". But of course this was an empty gesture, after the exposure of the perfidy of the Anglo-French policy which, step by step, had *encouraged* Hitler into preparing to attack Poland, and had *thwarted* the demand of the British and Soviet peoples for a resolute decision to stop him. The gesture was calculated rather to justify the almost complete inaction of Poland's "allies" when Hitler attacked, on September 1—inaction which Prof. Namier contrasts witheringly with a Franco-Polish military protocol of May 19, 1939, "stipulating that by the sixteenth day of war France should open an offensive with her main forces".

It was the perfidy of the then British and French Governments which gave Hitler the "green light" for war, not the German-Soviet pact of non-aggression which was only a measure of self-defence by the U.S.S.R. against that perfidy. Nor is it without significance that Sir Nevile Henderson, the British Ambassador, told Hitler on August 23 that "if an agreement had to be made with Moscow . . . I had rather Germany made it than ourselves." The German minute of the talk makes him also say that "he personally had never believed in an Anglo-French-Russian pact": which sounds probable, since Henderson himself said as much, in his *Failure of a Mission*, published in 1940 (p. 259).

These are the outstanding facts which emerge—amidst much other interesting minor detail—from Professor Namier's book. They confirm up to the hilt the charge made in *Falsifiers of History* that, while the Soviet Government steadily worked for an agreement, the behaviour of the British and French Governments showed that "a serious agreement was farthest from their thoughts" and that their purpose was "to give Hitler to understand that the U.S.S.R. had no allies, that the U.S.S.R. was isolated, that he could attack the U.S.S.R. without running the risk of encountering the resistance of Britain and France". It should be noted, at this point, that the Soviet publication quotes captured German minutes of conversations between Halifax and Hitler on November 19, 1937, and between Henderson and Hitler on March 3, 1938, which depict British policy even then (it was the peak of the German-Italian invasion of Spain and of Hitler's preparations to seize Austria), as encouraging Hitler in aggression because he was "a bulwark of the West against Bolshevism". It is to be hoped that the full texts of these documents will soon become available to British students of international affairs.

Professor Namier himself appears to have realised the utterly

damning nature of his exposure of British Tory policy, and tries occasionally to temper the effect by sneering remarks about the U.S.S.R. or its intentions during the 1939 negotiations. The weakness of these sneers, however, is that he is unable to support them by a single document such as he collects in great numbers, and with such skill, to indict Anglo-French policy. They remain as a consequence merely general insinuations, unsupported by facts. The main force of his argument goes the other way.

A characteristic remark—one of many—may be quoted here, from the section on the military negotiations (p. 204):

“Seeing the fate which befel Poland in September, 1939, while the French were engaged in patrol reconnaissance in the Saar and the R.A.F. was dropping copies of Chamberlain’s speech, like confetti, on Berlin, Russia’s caution can hardly be described as altogether unjustified.”

What Professor Namier, with scholarship prevailing over prejudice, did not attempt, the uninhibited State Department tried to do with its “highly specialised collection”. The survey we have made, however, reveals all the futility and dishonesty of the American effort to suggest that the Soviet Union was “double-crossing” Britain and France during the Moscow negotiations. For what do the German documents—making every allowance for their one-sided character—show?

On the *political* side they show (i) the Soviet Ambassador in Berlin on April 17 suggesting at the German Foreign Office that Soviet-German relations “might become better” (ii) Molotov on May 20 replying to the German Ambassador in Moscow that, if he wanted trade talks, the necessary “political bases” must be constructed; and adding on June 28, in reply to an offer from the Ambassador of “a normalisation of relations”, that the U.S.S.R. would welcome it too, since “it was not the fault of the Soviet Government if those relations had become bad” (iii) Babarin, deputy Soviet trade representative in Berlin, and Astakhov, Soviet Chargé d’Affaires, saying no more than that during a private dinner on July 27 that lasted over four hours (iv) Molotov telling the German Ambassador on August 3—in reply to Ribbentrop’s effusive assurances to Astakhov that “there was no problem from the Baltic to the Black Sea which could not be solved”—that “proofs of a changed attitude of the German Government were still lacking” (v) Astakhov telling the German Foreign Office on August 12—after the first day’s discussions between the Military Missions in Moscow—that the Soviet Government was now willing to start political discussions in Moscow, to be undertaken “by degrees” (vi) as late as August 18, after two plaintive appeals by Ribbentrop (August 15 and 16) to be allowed to come to Moscow, Molotov still reminding the Nazis of their years of violent hostility to the U.S.S.R., expressing pleasure if they now intended “a sincere improvement in political relations”; but insisting that the time was not yet ripe for Ribbentrop’s visit, and that, while there might be a non-aggression pact a little later, the first step must be a trade and credit agreement (vii) the Soviet Government agreeing on August 21

that Ribbentrop should come to Moscow two days later—and then only after a pleading telegram from Hitler to Stalin.

Throughout the Nazi documents, in fact, we see the Germans desperately trying to open political negotiations with the U.S.S.R. (Prof. Namier incidentally shows them busily spreading rumours about such negotiations long before there were any). Thus the Germans were pursuing a policy diametrically opposite to that of Chamberlain. And we see the U.S.S.R. holding off the Germans at arm's length, until the perfidy of the British and French Governments, in face of the threat to Poland, becomes unmistakable.

One document in particular—the statement by Molotov on August 18—finally and conclusively disposes of the story that the U.S.S.R. had been conducting “parallel negotiations” for a pact of non-aggression with Germany, while negotiating with Britain and France. It declared that only now—after Ribbentrop's message of August 15—was it prepared to alter its policy, in favour of an improvement of relations with Germany.

Well might Professor Namier write (even before the American documents) that the Soviet leaders “knew full well that they could have an agreement with Berlin at any time, on terms which called for no lengthy discussions”. In fact, it is clear that they did not turn to the Germans until they had no practical alternative. One has only to contrast this with the constant pleading of the British Government with the Nazis, public and private, throughout the Moscow negotiations, as summarised above and revealed in greater detail by the *Blue Book* of September, 1939, and Neville Henderson's *Failure of a Mission* of 1940, to realise who was doing the double-crossing.

On the *commercial* side, the lesson is just as plain. The Soviet leaders had never made a secret of their desire for “the strengthening of business relations with all countries” (Stalin at the 18th Party Congress on March 10, 1939)—Germany included. Molotov had said publicly on May 31, 1939 (at the Supreme Soviet): “While conducting negotiations (for mutual assistance) with Great Britain and France, we by no means consider it necessary to renounce business relations with countries like Germany and Italy.” He had then given a short account of negotiations since the beginning of 1938 with Germany (which had offered a credit of 200 million marks), and of how they had twice broken down. “To judge by certain signs, it is not out of the question that the negotiations may be resumed,” Molotov added. And in fact, all the American documents can show is that they were resumed—but only on July 22, after German efforts which began on May 30.

Contrast this picture with that of the continuous pleading of the British Government, publicly and above all privately, not for an ordinary commercial agreement, but for a world-wide division of markets, colonies, *Lebensraum*, even offering “huge credits” which would have financed Nazi aggression—provided it kept out of Britain's spheres of interest—and all reinforced by open sabotage of

the Moscow negotiations! Can there be any doubt that it was Chamberlain who was doing the double-crossing?

Unlike the outbreak of the 1914-18 war, therefore, the origins of the Second World War are not wrapped in darkness. On the contrary—thanks to the existence of a Socialist State, thanks to its diplomacy which realises the jungle laws of the imperialist world and consistently strives to bend them to the service of peace—the causes of the war are only too clear. They were: (i) the frenzied determination of German imperialism to launch a war of revenge for 1914-18, in order to carve up the world anew; (ii) the malignant and besotted determination of the British and French ruling classes (abetted by those of the U.S.A.) to try and turn the Germans against the U.S.S.R.

And the more the Foreign Offices and State Departments suppress Blue Books, garble despatches and “select” documents, the more inexorably and pitilessly the true facts stand out.

THE CASTE SYSTEM IN BRITAIN

By P. H. H. BRYAN

DISRAELI might have said that we were two nations—the rich and the poor—but a more modern and accurate sub-division of the people may be said to lie between those of us who go down to the local Employment Exchange to seek a living and those of us who don't. The boundary fence is being constructed stronger and higher, and is now in the process of being officially recognised and legalised. Those inside the fence—the fellows who line up at the “Labour”—are, of course, by far the more numerous and constitute what some political writers and economists call “the masses”, which is a term used to describe the majority when you are not appealing to them. It is against these that the Control of Engagement Order (born September, 1947) is directed. All managerial, professional, executive and administrative groups are exempt: and in my father's house there are many, many mansions.

When my friend Frank was demobilised from the Navy in 1946 (after getting shot at, burned and blown in and out of the water with tiresome frequency), he carefully and hopefully studied all the Careers pamphlets from Architecture to Zoology which a grateful government lavishly conferred upon him. The creators of this copious literature (referred to off the record as the “Hope” or “Carrot” scheme) carried out their duties with persistence and apparent contentment, under the undisputed illusion that most infantry privates or naval gunners had attained, or had commenced to study for, a scientific or technical degree. Frank's studies for the previous six years had lain in the direction of the sinking of E-boats, and so it was not long before he found himself, as other millions of ex-warriors had found themselves, queueing up down at the “Labour” for any sort of job at all.

His sociological education now commenced on a practical basis. He learned that although the parrot-cry "shortage of labour" was resounding throughout the land from press, pulpit and microphone, it was nevertheless almost impossible to obtain any sort of a decent job with a reputable undertaking. Only the very scourings of employment were on the Employment Exchange lists—jobs which, by reasons of bad pay, arduous conditions, unhealthy conditions or unwholesome management, few men would stick for very long, with the resultant constant interchange of labour. There were half-a-dozen undertakings who comprised the "constants" at the Exchange. Indeed, they were the only firms who regularly used the Exchange, for any vacancy with a "good" employer was snapped up overnight by personal application without the facilities of the Ministry of Labour being used.

These half-dozen "constants" included:

1. Quarry work. 10 miles out of the city. Heavy work, hard on hands. Exposed to all weathers. No canteen.
2. Gas Works. Stoking. Red Sea heat and very unhealthy because of fumes. Fainting common.
3. Provender Mill. Work mainly loading and unloading lorries. Heavy animal work, carrying bags up to 2 cwt. Sweatshop atmosphere. No canteen.
4. Paint Works. Handling bags of paint powder. The fine powder penetrates into the pores and hot baths will not shift it. Destructive to clothes, pillows and sheets. Even months after ceasing this work, a bout of heavy perspiration will bring out red stain.

There are unfortunately no periodical published reports, showing the worker's assessment, on a points system, of any particular employment. We can see at a glance in the press the daily state of stocks and shares, the situation of any football team, or the form of any racehorse. But vital information of our means of livelihood is kept (wisely, no doubt) a dark secret, obtainable only by actual experience or by constant contact with those in possession of local knowledge.

Frank, faced with half-a-dozen alternatives, chose what appeared to him to be the least of the evils—the provender mill. Thereafter he became, for eight hours a day, a human mule, carrying, pushing and tugging sacks of cattle-food weighing as much as himself. He hoped, as so many ex-servicemen have hoped, that this brutish labour would only be a temporary phase, and that sooner or later society would find for him a place in which his qualifications of intelligence, honesty, strength, youth and adaptability would be expressed. With this hope, he launched a campaign of applications and was just getting into his stride with the technique of this difficult art, when along came the Control of Engagement Order to put paid to all such ambitions.

And then, one recent Saturday morning, he was told not to leave at the normal hour of twelve noon, but to work on until nine at night. On his stating that he did not want to, he was instantly dismissed. So back he went to the "Labour". The old "constants" were put

before him, just as they had been in pre-Control Order days, only now there was a difference: the threat of compulsion, and, if necessary, compulsion. Frank was offered Quarries and Paints. "Why not direct me back to the mill?" enquired Frank. "They still cannot get enough men and you are still sending other men there."

"You have been dismissed", replied the Employment Exchange clerk, severely, "and it is very improbable that they would accept you again." His tone inferred that a serious and most improper breach of Ministry of Labour policy had been suggested.

"Do you mean to say", asked Frank, "that, although I have to go wherever you send me, the employer is under no obligation to take me on?". The clerk indicated that that was how things were.

Frank is now working in a rather grim-looking quarry. When it rains, he gets wet; when it is cold, he gets cold; and any time it may please a foreman, he may get the sack. He will then, presumably, go to Paints as the only remaining alternative.

He is feeling oppressed and depressed and he certainly has a strong right to feel this way. What has the Control Order done to him? To all practical, everyday effect (and that is the only sort of effect that is worth a damn) he is now legally and officially scheduled as a hewer of wood and a drawer of water; to all practical effect he is debarred from applying for any post of responsibility. Although he may be forcibly sent to labour in a quarry, his employers are not forced to keep him. They can fire him when they like, and need not take him back again. But if he should leave on his own accord, he can be directed back the next day. It is difficult to imagine a more one-sided bargain.

How does the Control Order affect the employers? The better employer, offering reasonable conditions of pay, security, and amenities, has never been short of any sort of labour and has not had need to use the Employment Exchange; and consequently derives no benefit from the Control Order. It is the less desirable employers who profit so much by the Order that they could hardly have drafted it better themselves. These staunch advocates of free enterprise can now sit back and watch the next draft of conscript labour roll in. They need no longer waste money on canteens and superannuation funds and the like, as do their more foolish and more scrupulous competitors. There is no longer any need to attempt to preserve a cordial relationship with labour. They can still use the old weapon of the sack, knowing that a dismissed employee will be sent to a similarly undesirable job by the Employment Exchange. They can well adopt the simple policy of "Drive 'em to the limit. Isaacs will send us more". In short, they are having placed in their hands most of the advantages of slave-labour—and none of the responsibilities.

What about the "exemptees" from the Control Order? Do they benefit or suffer? They have no immediate positive advantages, like the undesirable employer, but they will benefit in a negative fashion. The managerial, professional, executive and administrative classes

enjoy a form of employment which ensures a decent standard of living and a good measure of security. From now on they need fear no outside competition from the outside world. The little insertion at the head of the "Appointments Vacant" column restricts the struggle to fellow-exemptees only. Our friend Frank may have done more organising and more leading of men in his six Navy years than his works manager has done in a lifetime, but that will avail him little now.

And so we had better leave him in his quarry, lifting 80 lb. stones. His status in life was "frozen" at the 1947 level and he is beginning to realise that he will probably always be a labourer; and his children (unless they turn to genius or crime) will be labourers, no doubt in the same quarries and mills and paint works. For discriminatory legislation, although designed to be used with discretion at the outset, always becomes more rigid as time goes on. It is the letter of the law, not the spirit, that is passed down into history.

In our quiet English way, we have brought into being a system that bears many of the hallmarks of the compulsory-occupation-for-dirty-work-only method of the East. Let us hope that, if Frank's children are to be our industrial untouchables, they will have a tribune of their own to speak for them.

100 Years Ago

THE JUNE REVOLUTION

"Thus we began" wrote Engels thirty-six years later "on June 1, 1848, with a very limited share capital, of which only a little had been paid up, and the shareholders themselves were more than uncertain. Half of them deserted us immediately after the first number, and at the end of the month we no longer had any at all . . . It was due in the first place to his (Marx's) clear view and his firm attitude that the paper became the most famous German newspaper of the year of revolution."

The leading article of 6th June, as against the federal programme of the Lefts in Frankfurt, put forward the demand for a single indivisible German republic.

But the great event of the month was the June uprising of the Paris proletariat, and its bloody suppression. Each day of it from 22nd to 25th was dealt with in the New Rhenish Gazette. "From the first shot we stood unconditionally on the side of the insurgents. After their defeat, Marx celebrated the vanquished in one of his most powerful articles." It was from this article that Marx himself inserted the famous "Order reigns in Warsaw" paragraph in Class Struggles in France 1848-1850 in which also there are the sentences about the Paris workers, who "were left no choice: they had to starve or start to fight. They answered on June 22nd with the tremendous insurrection in which the first great battle was fought between the two classes that split modern society." From this article (which cost them the support of the last of their shareholders) we print the introductory paragraph and then the concluding portions.

NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG, JUNE 29, 1848

The Paris workers have been *suppressed* by superior force but they have not *succumbed* to it. They have been *beaten* but their

adversaries have been *conquered*. The momentary triumph of brute force has been bought at the cost of the destruction of all the illusions and imaginings of the February revolution, the dissolutions of the entire old-republican party, the splitting of the French nation into two nations, the nation of owners and the nation of workers. The republic of the tricolour has now only *one colour*, the colour of the beaten, the *colour of blood*. It has become the *red republic*

The National Assembly has the job of undoing February, at least as far as the workers are concerned, and throwing them back into their old conditions. But even that did not happen because it is as little in the power of a National Assembly as of a king to evoke an industrial crisis of universal character: *up to now!* The National Assembly, in its brutal eagerness to have done with the irksome February phrases, did not even adopt the measures which were possible on the basis of the old conditions. The Paris workers aged 17-25 were pressed into the army or thrown on to the streets; outside workers were deported from Paris to La Sologne, without even paying them the money necessary for their passports; adult Parisians were provisionally furnished with charity in militarily organised workshops, on condition that they ceased to be republicans.

Neither sentimental rhetoric after the February fashion sufficed, nor the brutal legislation of the May 15 type. The decision had to be made factually, practically. "Have you canaille made the February revolution for yourselves or for us?" The bourgeoisie put the question in such a way that it had to answer June—with grape-shot and barricades.

Yet, as one of the people's representatives said on June 25, the whole National Assembly is struck with stupor. It remains stupefied while question and answer soak the Paris pavements with blood, some being stupefied because their illusions are dissolved in gun-powder smoke, others because they cannot understand how the people can dare to come out independently on behalf of its own most special interests. Russian gold, English gold, the Bonaparte eagle, the lily, talismans of all kinds, have to be invoked to make this peculiar

DEMOCRATIE NOUVELLE

This foremost French cultural and political journal has produced a special June number, containing:

"Science at the Service of Death?" by F. JOLIOT-CURIE, world-famous scientist.

"Culture in Danger" by LOUIS ARAGON, leading French novelist and poet.

"Peace is necessary—and possible" by HENRY WALLACE, and K. ZILLIACUS, M.P., writes on "*Fraternité Socialiste*"

50 francs. 29 rue du Quatre-Septembre, PARIS

occurrence accessible to their intellect. Both parts of the Assembly, however, feel that an unfathomable gulf separates them from the people. None dare raise themselves on behalf of the people.

As soon as the stupor is over, frenzy breaks out and the majority rightly ejects from its midst those wretched utopians and hypocrites who commit the anachronism of still talking about *fraternité*. It is indeed precisely a question of abolishing this phrase and the illusions concealed in its equivocal bosom. When Larochejaquelin, the Legitimist, the knightly zealot, declaims against the infamy of crying out *Vae Victis*, woe to the defeated, the majority of the Assembly is seized with St. Vitus dance, as if it had been stung by a tarantula. It cries "Woe!" over the workers, to hide that the "defeated" is none other than itself. Either it must now go under or the republic. That is why it howls convulsively: Long live the republic!

Is the deep abyss which has opened before us to be allowed to lead democrats astray, to be allowed to delude us into imagining that struggles around the form of state are empty, illusory, nil?

Only feeble, cowardly minds can raise the question. The collisions which arise from the conditions of bourgeois society itself have to be fought out to the end, they cannot be conjured away. The best form of State is that in which the social antagonisms are not blurred, are not forcibly, and therefore not artificially, not apparently, fettered. The best form of State is that in which they reach an open fight, and, consequently, a solution.

We shall be asked whether we have no tears, no sighs, no words for the victims who fell before the fury of the populace, for the National Guard, the Garde Mobile, the Republican Guard, the Line?

The State will care for their widows and orphans, decrees will glorify them, ceremonial funerals will consign their remains to the tomb, the official press will declare them immortal, the European reaction will pay homage to them from East to West.

But the plebeians, torn by hunger, scorned by the press, deserted by the doctors, abused as thieves, incendiaries, galley slaves by the honest, their wives and children thrown into still more unbounded misery, their best living ones deported overseas—to wind the laurel wreath about their menacing, gloomy brows, that is the privilege, that is the right, of the democratic press.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into any correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: United Kingdom, 12 months 12s. Postage paid. Abroad, 13s. from LABOUR MONTHLY, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3, or from all leading wholesalers and bookshops.

Book Reviews

Palestine

The Rape of Palestine by William B. Ziff (St. Botolph Publishing Co.), 599 pp., 18s.

MR. ZIFF'S book was first published in the United States in 1938, where it caused considerable comment. Later, it was used as a source-book by the League of Nations Permanent Mandates Commission. The current edition has been brought up to date.

The author, a convinced Zionist, whose attitude on the Palestine question is near to that of the Zionist Revisionist Party, has, with tremendous energy and care, gathered together a mass of information on the relations between the Mandatory Power (Britain) and the Palestine Jewish Community.

According to Mr. Ziff, the British Government, despite speeches made by responsible Ministers and politicians to the contrary, has consistently sabotaged the achievements of the Jews in Palestine and endeavoured to strangle their national revival ever since the Balfour Declaration of 1917.

Through literally hundreds of pages of heavily documented text, Mr. Ziff covers every aspect of British policy towards the Zionists. He accuses Britain of organising Arab pogroms against the Jews on at least three occasions; of favouring Arab interests against Jewish throughout the whole period; of introducing discriminatory taxation against the Jews; of sabotaging Jewish industry; of preventing the export of the vital citrus crop; of punishing Jews under the law and letting Arabs go scot-free; of illegally dismembering Transjordan from Palestine, and of many other crimes too numerous to relate here.

Those chapters which deal with the Palestine Arabs are, however, less convincing. They are, in fact, complete nonsense. For example, Mr. Ziff spends a number of pages endeavouring to prove that Arabs do not exist. "Actually", he writes, "there are no Arabs anywhere . . . throughout the Peninsula the Arab has ceased to exist. Those who have taken his

place are a motley assortment of peoples, low in the scale of human development, who speak the Arabic tongue". Later, he quotes "the Arab works about ten days out of 365 and all forms of manual labour are abhorrent to him"—ridiculous to all who know Palestine. He paints a picture of a vicious character who "Under his *abaya* wears a long, wicked-looking stiletto which he will use with lightning quickness on the slightest provocation".

Discussing the solution for Palestine, Mr. Ziff rejects both Partition and the Unitary State. He wants Palestine as a Jewish State on both sides of the Jordan, mass immigration from Europe assisted by the Great Powers.

There can be little doubt that what Mr. Ziff voices here in the open, is also the less openly expressed desire of the more reactionary leaders of the Zionist movement and especially of the terrorist groups like Irgun and the Sternists, whose cause Mr. Ziff espouses.

In the earlier part of the book Mr. Ziff presents information which constitutes a most considerable indictment of British Imperialism in its day-to-day actions in one small but vitally strategic country. Yet he cannot follow the logic of his own writing. He attributes the excesses of British rule not so much to the nature of Imperialism but to the anti-semitism of the Colonial Office officials. He cannot see that Britain's aim was to divide and rule and that she has made an enemy also of the Arabs, who are so much despised by the author.

Today, events have outdistanced even the voluble Mr. Ziff. Writing in 1947 he placed great hopes in the power of the American people to enforce a solution in Palestine favourable to Jewish aspirations. Now he must face the fact that the imperialist U.S. Government has been the architect of betrayal of the only solution which now has a chance of success and which is actually being forged in the flames of civil war in Palestine at the present time. Complete independence for the whole country, the withdrawal of British troops, two States, Jewish and Arab,

are the ways in which Palestine can free itself from provocative foreign intervention, and its peoples live peacefully together.

MICHAEL KATANKA.

An Honest Voice

Marching With The Times 1931-1946, by Douglas Goldring (Nicholson and Watson, 10s 6d).

It is to the credit of the English liberal tradition (the real English liberal tradition—not the servile flunkeydom which parades in the press controlled by Bank of England Directors and cocoa plantation millionaires) that in the worst periods of reactionary official policy there have always been a chosen few who have not been afraid to speak out, and to meet all the opprobrium of taking their stand alongside the militant socialist minority. Douglas Goldring, after a long record in the world of literature, carries forward the honourable tradition.

His "Nineteen Twenties" (reviewed in this journal in May, 1946) was already a challenging social record and indictment. The present continuation to 1946 is the more important because it is a powerful and lively contribution to current controversy, which has been received with audible silence in the general press. It is a courageous book to appear under existing conditions. In the worst days of the old Munichite degradation there was at least a considerable opposition press. In the new Munichite lower depths there is at present no opposition press other than the Communist. Hence the special value of such a book as this, which does attempt to voice the unvoiced millions who, without being Communist, are alarmed at the present return to Tory policy and hysterical preparation for a new and disastrous war. As the author writes:

"If any normally honest, patriotic and 'progressive' member of our floating electorate has the temerity to object to his son's grave being spat upon by the boanergic Bevin and his 'Socialist' accomplices, then immediately there arises a howl that he is either a 'Com-

munist' or a 'crypto-Communist'. Much as I respect the courage, sincerity and enthusiasm of individual members of our tiny Communist Party, I think it is altogether too much to credit them with a monopoly of common sense and decent feeling. It is true that at the moment the Communists are the only Party in Great Britain not under 'ruling class' domination. But there are millions of us opposed to 'Bevinism', if only through the instinct of self-preservation."

Readers will find plenty to disagree with in these stimulating pages, which tumble forth in a gloriously disordered conglomeration of crotchets and crusades, irritatingly crammed with rejected letters to editors and a medley of press cuttings. But it is refreshingly alive and sincere, tells the truth about many things, and what the author has to say is worth saying and well worth bringing to the attention of the general reader.

R. P. D.

Shorter Notice

Local and Regional Government by G. D. H. Cole (Cassell, 15s, 295 pp.).

Now that the Local Government Boundary Commission has confessed itself unable to act sensibly within its present terms of reference, and has instead joined up with the large body of opinion urging reform of local government structure and areas, it seems likely that the Government will be obliged to come to some sort of decision on the question—if only to define its attitude in principle.

At such a time, a book such as this might have had considerable influence in shaping the future course of events, aiming as it does to devise a flexible system which will combine opportunities for planning on the widest scale with the maximum participation of the people themselves in running their own affairs. Unfortunately, though Mr. Cole himself shows an admirable grasp of the problems involved, he makes it very difficult for his reader to grasp precisely what he advocates by way of their solution.

N. BRANSON.

subscriptions for those overseas who cannot pay for one reason or another.

The friendliest messages pass between givers and receivers. Describing himself as "a socialistic author and therefore very interested in the activity of all progressives", a "receiver" in Dresden ends his letter:

"I take leave of you with the greeting of our great American friend, Jack London, yours in the name of revolution."

Another writes from the Russian Zone:

"It is so very kind of you. I am teaching English in a secondary school and our boys and girls will be very interested in the articles of your magazine."

Surely all readers will endorse our reply: "Best wishes to you, and your pupils!"

Turning to another part of the world, foundations are laid for a warm friendship between an old Labour stalwart, now a pensioner in an Australian Old Men's Home, and a reader in Middlesex, who is sending him a regular weekly parcel of magazines and periodicals.



USEFUL PAMPHLETS

Readers are constantly asking us for LABOUR MONTHLY pamphlets which are now out of print. This list of those of which some copies still are available may be useful:

"There ARE No Aryans" (6d). R. Page Arnot's lively exposure of racial theories.

"The Mosley Case" (6d), by D. N. Pritt, K.C., M.P.

"Trade Unions and Communism" (3d), by Arthur Horner.

"Karl Marx: Political Foundations" (1s), by Professor Roy Pascal.

THE READERS' LAMENT

We had some complaints this month . . . yes, actually, complaints! Readers found there was a famine of May LABOUR MONTHLY in some parts by the end of the first week. Anyone who has not yet succeeded in getting a copy and needs it for his file, should write to The Manager, 134 Ballards Lane, N.3, as some may be still available. And the moral is, ORDER EARLY from bookshops and newsagents. It is not always easy for them to estimate their demand. A little consideration for them makes their job—and ours—easier, and silences the readers' lament.



LABOUR MONTHLY postbag brings odd, but happy, contrasts together sometimes. Here, without comment, are a few:

THE COLONEL

"As and when space permits, articles are needed on countries out East and in the Far East, where, in my humble opinion, the movement is spreading, and will continue to spread very rapidly, and may influence world affairs far more in the not far distant future than a good many people in Europe imagine."

Lt.-Colonel (Surrey).

. . . AND THE PRIVATE

"I know when I was in the forces out in the Far East I used to be very pleased to receive the Labour Monthly and other progressive

literature, so I would like to do the same for someone in the same position."

Ex-Private (Lancs).

"WHAT A WONDERFUL THING!" . . .

"Mr. R. Palme Dutt's article 'May Day and the Fight for Peace' is really a marvellous exposition of the international set-up. What a wonderful thing it would be if a copy of it could be put through the letterbox of every house in England and the United States tomorrow!"

(A life-long Conservative, whose horror and fury at the war preparations, and the continual war propaganda in the Press and B.B.C., prompted him in May to take out a subscription to "Labour Monthly.")

. . . "THESE ARE DIFFERENT DAYS"

"Witch hunts and expulsions! Shades of MacDonald! His apt pupil and protégé is well to the fore. However, these are different days from 1925. How tremendous has been the workers' international advance since then. Let this nerve us for the struggles ahead. Here's my usual 6s. for one of the main spear-heads of our movement."

L. R. (Essex)

RISING TIDE . . .

And the last piece of news is that within a few days of the Big Stick being used against Labour M.P.s who expressed international solidarity with their brother party in Italy, more applications for postal subscriptions reached us on notepaper headed "House of Commons" than for many months. Coincidence? Or is it just one wave of a rising tide of indignation?

. . . RISING COSTS

Rising tides brings us to the question of rising costs. Our development fund total has not risen above March, but costs have. Here are the names of those who appreciated our magazine enough to send us, during April,

£23 3s. 10d.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
G. M. Harrison	2	5	0	Other contributions came from:			
T.W.R.	1	0	0	S. Jones		3	0
L. Rowan		6	0	C. M. Hall		8	0
Anon., Whitchurch		1	0	A. R. Watson		8	0
Dr. R. M. Lang		8	0	D. H. Calcutt		8	0
W. F. Iakin-Smith		2	0	F. Quilon		10	0
D. M. Clarke	10	0	0	A. Taylor		8	0
A. Elliott		6	0	D. W. Smith		3	0
J.B., Chelmsford	10	0	0	S.W.B.	1	6	0
L'Humanité		2	0	S. G. Bloomfield		1	10
J. Ruddock		9	0	R. E. Selway		5	6
P. J. Davis		2	0	W. Allan		5	0
G. E. and M. F. A. Philibert	10	0	0	B. Robshaw		2	0
H. N. Humphreys		3	6	Mrs. A. Palme Dutt	1	8	0
T. Flood		2	6	H. N. Merrion		8	0
D. H. Strathern and Friends		5	0	D.E.F.	3	0	0
Royston Green		3	6	H.S.W., Kilmarnock		2	6
Olivia Greene	2	0	0	R. Stevenson		9	0
S. Morrissey		10	0	Mrs. S. Task		2	0
F. Renouf		5	0	C. G. Roberts		8	0
O.A.P. (Late Lt. M.)		1	0	B. Brain		8	0
Director	2	0	0	J.W.M.		8	0

Many thanks to all.—ANGELA TUCKETT (Manager).

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Dorchester and District Newspapers, Ltd (T.U.), Dorchester, Great Britain.